arXiv:1610.08631v1 [q-bio.MN] 27 Oct 2016

Random matrix analysis for gene interaction networks in cancer cells

Ayumi Kikkawa

Mathematical and Theoretical Physics Unit,
Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University,
1919-1 Tancha, Onna-son, Kunigami-gun, Okinawa, 904-0495
Japan

October 28, 2016

Abstract

Motivation: The investigation of topological modifications of the gene interaction networks in cancer cells is essential for understanding the desease. We study gene interaction networks in various human cancer cells with the random matrix theory. This study is based on the Cancer Network Galaxy (TCNG) database which is the repository of huge gene interactions inferred by Bayesian network algorithms from 256 microarray experimental data downloaded from NCBI GEO. The original GEO data are provided by the high-throughput microarray expression experiments on various human cancer cells. We apply the random matrix theory to the computationally inferred gene interaction networks in TCNG in order to detect the universality in the topology of the gene interaction networks in cancer cells.

Results: We found the universal behavior in almost one half of the 256 gene interaction networks in TCNG. The distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing of the gene interaction matrix becomes the Wigner distribution when the network is large (condensed), and it behaves as Poisson distribution when the network is smaller. We also observe the transition between the Poisson and the Wigner distributions as the threshold of confidence factor of the gene interactions is shifted. We expect that the random matrix theory provides an effective analytical method for investigating the huge interaction networks of the various transcripts in cancer cells.

Contact:akikkawa@oist.jp

1 Background

The human cells store DNA molecule which codes more than 20,000 genes in their nucleus. They turn on/off the transcriptions of the genes in accordance with the cellular cycles, the circumstances and the cell types, and process various kinds of molecules such as proteins. There are more than 10,000 kinds of proteins in the living cells at the same time. Among them, the protein which stays alone is rare. They interact each other and construct huge complex interaction networks. These interactions sometimes promote the functions of the proteins and sometimes they inhibit each other. The protein-protein interaction networks thus regulate the cell behavior under ever changing circumstances. In the nucleus, the genes which code these interacting proteins have the spatial and the temporal correlations in their expression patterns. From the observation of the gene co-expression patterns with the high-throughput experiments such as microarray or next-generation sequencing technology, the gene interaction networks which are related especially to human disease including cancer have been studied extensively. ([Pe'er and Hacohen, 2011])

Recent studies have revealed that there are also large regions which do not code any protein in the DNA molecule, and they are also highly transcribed. These transcripts are called non-coding RNAs. ([Mattick and Makunin, 2005]) The importance of such non-coding RNAs as the regulators of gene expressions has become widely known to date from various experiments. ([Flamant *et al.*, 2010, Guo *et al.*, 2013]) It is known that the non-coding RNAs interact or bind with other transcripts selectively and thus regulate gene expressions. ([Léveillé *et al.*, 2015, Taft *et al.*, 2010]) The micro RNAs, which is about 20nt subset of the non-coding RNAs, have also observed to negatively regulate gene expressions through interactions with other RNAs or even with the DNA. ([Bartel, 2009]) These interaction networks of transcripts have important role in cellular cycles including cell development, proliferation, apoptosis and disease. ([Cech,T.R. and Steitz,J.A., 2014]) However, the behavior of such complex networks are totally unknown yet.

The relation between the various diseases such as cancer and the modification of such molecular networks has also been extensively studied. ([Jonsson and Bates, 2006, Jonsson *et al.*, 2006, Sanz-Pamplona *et al.*, 2012, Kling *et al.*, 2015, Creixell *et al.*, 2015]) For example, several micro RNAs behave as inhibitors for specific interactions in the transcripts network, and they act as potential oncogenes or tumor genes as the result of permitting uncontrolled proliferation of damaged cells. ([Lim *et al.*, 2005])

The investigation of topological modifications of such transcripts networks in the damaged cells is also important for the discovery of new biomarkers or the detailed classification of the symptoms. ([Vidal *et al.*, 2011, Goh *et al*, 2007]) The high-throughput experimental studies on cancer cells provide huge molecular interaction networks which include 20,000 to two million elements from a single assay. Such experiments have become very popular these days owing to wide distributions of commercial platforms. The raw data from such experiments are later accessible on the internet, for example the NCBI GEO (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/) provides the public database of gene ex-

pression data which can be downloaded freely. ([Barrett *et al.*, 2011]) By using these data, it is also possible to do the meta-analytic study of gene expressions. For example, from the multiple data obtained from several different microarray experiments on specific cancer cells, one may investigate some typical gene interaction networks of the cancer under study.

The computational inference of the gene interactions with the expression data begins with the statistical procedures such as clustering or the principal component analysis. Then the individual interactions between genes are computationally calculated using various network algorithms. The inferred interactions are usually provided with the confidence factor or the likelihood which manifests the probability of the interaction. There are several gene interaction network databases which is based on, for example, the mutual information (ARACNE) ([Margolin *et al.*, 2006]), the Bayesian inference (SiGN-BN) ([Tamada *et al.*, 2011]) and much more. ([Le Novère, 2015, Creixell *et al.*, 2015])

In graph theory, the elements in the network are called nodes and the interaction between two nodes is expressed by an edge in between. These edges may have directions. In the case of protein-protein interaction network, the interaction edges are usually non-directed. In the gene interaction networks, the directed edges express the regulatory relations between genes.

There are many other networks, such as web-site relationships network, social networks, as well as the biological transcripts networks, which are all known to have universal behaviors. One of such universal behaviors, the scale free behavior is extensively studied so far. ([Barabási, 2009]) In the scale free network, there are special nodes called hubs which have remarkably large number of edges (degree), and other nodes have a few or only one edge. Furthermore, the distribution of the degree k obeys asymptotical powerlaw behavior.

$$N(k) \sim k^{-\lambda} \qquad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Where $\lambda < 2$. Such universal behavior of the interaction networks including the transcripts networks in living cells have been one of the key in the study of the system biology.

The computational inference of the gene interactions using the gene expression data are usually highly time consuming since it includes huge iterative learning procedures in selected groups of nodes. Thus the obtained network size is usually limited. In order to manage the large network size up to the order of $10,000$ genes, the calculation must be parallelized and performed on the supercomputers equipped with many CPUs. Once the gene interaction is computationally obtained, it should contain much noise due to the experiment, the statistical manupulation of data, and the inferrence learning. So the calculated edges should be experimentally confirmed in-vivo microscopically with the techniques such as knocking down gene experiments in living organisms or RNA interference afterwards. On the other hand, in the investigation of the relation between the disease and the topological modification of gene interaction networks, a new method which enables us to obtain the macroscopic view of a huge complex network is also necessary.

The random matrix theory (RMT)([Akemann *et al.*, 2011]) has been applied to a variety of fields not only in physics but also in the biological field. RMT is used in the analysis of the complex networks including protein-protein interactions or gene expression correlation patterns. ([Luo *et al.*, 2006, Luo *et al.*, 2007]) Previously, we also have studied the protein-protein interaction in many organisms including human, yeast, and Arabidopsis with RMT method and obtained universal behaviors in the distribution of the nearest neighbor level spacing of interaction (or adjacency) matrices. This distribution is called the Wigner distribution. Moreover, in the protein-protein interaction related to oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes in human cells, we have found that the Wigner distribution changes to the Poisson distribution. From these studies we consider that RMT gives a clue to the understanding of the huge complex networks in cells.

In this work, we apply the RMT analysis for the Cancer Network Galaxy (TCNG) gene interaction networks obtained from 256 microarray expression data on cancer cells. The gene interactions are computationally inferred with the non-parametric Bayesian algorithm which is named SiGN-BN. ([Tamada *et al.*, 2011]) They have used the gene expression data on various cancer cells from NCBI GEO for this Bayesian inference calculations. In TCNG, the inferred gene interactions (directed edges) are supplied with the factor called edge frequency, which expresses the confidence factor of the gene interaction. We study the difference of the topologies of gene interaction networks in relation to the threshold of the confidence factor of edges and to the network size.

2 Method

2.1 The Cancer Network Galaxy (TCNG) database

The Cancer Network Galaxy (TCNG) (http://tcng.hgc.jp) is the database of computationally obtained gene interaction networks based on the NCBI GEO data of gene expression experiments with human cancer related samples. The selected experiments are 256 gene expression assays on various platforms. The Bayesian network model is applied in order to calculate the gene interactions. TCNG (Release 0.14 built on Wed Mar 30 15:00:31 2016) currently stores more than 16 million edges between the 24,907 nodes. The edges are given with directions and the edge frequencies as edge attributes. The learning calculations of the Bayesian networks are heavily time and memory consuming. With the use of the algorithm named NNSR (the neighbor node sampling and repeat), they have obtained considerably large gene interaction networks on the RIKEN AICS K supercomputer.[Tamada *et al.*, 2011]

In the Bayesian network model, the directed edge between the two nodes gives the causal relationship between them. When it is applied to the gene interaction, this direction of the edges may infer the regulatory relationships between the genes. However, in this study we will compare the gene interaction network analysis with the method of Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) RMT, we neglect the direction of the edges totally.

2.2 The random matrix theory

Since late 1950s, the random matrix theory has been grown in the study of spectra emissions from heavy nuclei by Wigner, Dyson and Mehta. ([Mehta, 1991]) So far it has been applied to a large variety of fields in physics and also in mathematics. ([Akemann *et al.*, 2011]) A lot of experimental studies also have been done with the RMT approach, such as in the Anderson localization in mesoscopic systems or in the quantum chaos. RMT has also applicable to a variety of networks in biological systems including the protein-protein interaction network, and its universal behavior has been discussed. ([Luo *et al.*, 2006])

There are thee random matrices which are categorized by the symmetries of the matrices under consideration, the Gaussian orthogonal matrices (GOE), the Gaussian unitary matrices (GUE), and the Gaussian symplectic matrices (GSE). In GOE the random matrix is real symmetric whose elements are Gaussian distributed random values. In the same way, the symmetry of matrix is unitary in GUE case and symplectic in GSE case. In all cases, the distribution of adjacent eigenvalues or nearest neighbor level spacing (NNS) is universal. It is called the Wigner distribution.

$$\begin{aligned} P_\beta(s) &= A\left(\frac{s}{D}\right)^\beta exp\left(-\alpha(s/D)^{1+\beta}\right) \\ \alpha &= \left[D\Gamma\left(\frac{2+\beta}{1+\beta}\right)\right]^{1+\beta}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $A = (1+\beta)\alpha$ and D is the average density of the eigenvalues and $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma function. ([Mehta, 1991, Brody, 1973]) The β is 1 in GOE, 2 in GUE and 4 in GSE case, respectively.

The Wigner distribution of NNS shows that the eigenvalues have mutual correlations and repel each other. On the contrary, when the eigenvalues do not have a mutual correlation, NNS distributes as Poisson distribution. In this case $\beta = 0$ in Eq.(1) and there is no level repulsion. In many experimental studies including numerical ones, the universal behavior due to the level repulsion are observed independent of the details of the systems.

2.3 The interaction matrices for gene network

The interaction matrix M for the gene interaction network in which the elements are the top 8,000 expressing genes in the microarray experiment is constructed as follows. The directions of Bayesian inferred edges are omitted. Then the elements M_{ij} is given as

$$M_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is an edge between node } i \text{ and node } j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We set $M_{ij} = M_{ji}$. This real symmetric matrix M is called the adjacency matrix in the graph theory. The self-interaction is neglected as $M_{ii} = 0$. The matrix size is about $8,000$ for each gene networks after we omitt dupulications. The median of number of non-zero elements of matrices M is about $80,000$ which

is equal to twice as the number of edges in the network. The gene interaction networks in TCNG are identified with the network index(ID) from 1 to 256. The accession number for NCBI GEO for the raw data and the information of experimental details of each network ID are also provided in TCNG database.

The 256 NCBI GEO data selected for the Bayesian network calculation in TCNG are all human cancer related gene expression experiments. The 119 of them are on the platform Affymetrix Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 Array (GPL570) and the 73 on Affymetrix Human Genome U133A Array (GPL96). There are several other platforms from Agilent Technologies and Illumina Inc., etc. The number of edges inferred differs in each array experiments, its median is about $38,000$, the minimum is about $13,000$, and the maximum is about $64,000$. We construct the interaction matrix M for the edges which have the same network IDs, and the distribution of the NNS of eigenvalues are calculated for each M. The confidence factor or edge frequency takes the value $0.2 - 1.0$. We categorize the edges in the gene network by the edge frequencies into four quartiles and the distribution of NNS $P(s)$ is calculated for each of the groups.

The classification and the extraction of the data using SQLite and the eigenvalue calculations by MATLAB (R2016a) scripts are both performed on the local Linux machine. Before the NNS distribution is obtained, the eigenvalues are rescaled with the popular statistical techniques called unfolding. ([Reichl, 1992]) This unfolding procedure is described as follows.

We first rescale a part of succeeding eigenvalues in order to set the density of the eigenvalues to be $D = 1$. The typical number of the selected eigenvalues is about 300. Then the staircase function $N(d)$ is calculated where d is the rescaled eigenvalue. By definition $N(d)$ is the number of eigenvalues less than d. The unfolding is equivalent to rescale d to $\tilde{d}$ again, as the result $N(\tilde{d})$ become a linear function of $\tilde{d}$. For this purpose, we use MATLAB built-in function *polyfit*.

3 Results

3.1 Distribution of nearest neighbor spacing depends on the gene network size

We first show the results of the gene networks in which the number of edges is less than the median $38,000$. Figure 1 is the distribution of NNS calculated for the network ID:236 (NCBI GEO accession number GSE7904) in TCNG. The number of inferred edges is $32,124$ and the gene expression experiments are performed with human breast tumor tissue of 62 samples. The experimental platform is Affymetrix Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 Array (GPL570). We categorize the edges into four groups by the edge frequency.

In Fig.1 the distribution $P(s)$ obtained from the largest edge frequency $(0.5-1.0)$ group is plotted. The distribution $P(s)$ becomes Poisson distribution. In Figure 2, we show the distributions $P(s)$ for the typical nine gene interaction networks in the same class of gene network size where the number of edges are less than $38,000$. In all these gene interaction networks, the Poisson distribution



Figure 1: **Distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing in the sparse gene interaction network.** From the gene interaction network in TCNG database [ID:236], the interaction (adjacency) matrix M is constructed. The matrix size is 7,928 which is the number of identical genes after removing the duplications. The total number of edges is 32,124 in this network. The 8,031 edges which are in the highest edge frequency $(0.5-1.0)$ quartile are used in the calculation of M. For the unfolding, we selected 357 eigenvalues in the range $1.25-1.5$. The solid line shows the Poisson distribution and the dashed line is the Wigner distribution.

of NNS are observed.



Figure 2: **The nearest neighbor level spacing distributions for nine gene interaction networks in TCNG.** The distributions obey Poisson distribution in the nine different gene interaction networks in TCNG database. The number of total edges are, 30 042 (ID:49), 30 214 (ID:27), 30 563 (ID:43), 30 957 (ID:96), 31 326 (ID:45), 32 124 (ID:236), 33 672 (ID:123), 34 440 (ID:144) and 34 912 (ID:16), respectively. They are randomly chosen from the sparse network group where the total number of edges are less than 38,000 (median of edge numbers of 256 gene networks). The solid line is the Poisson distribution and the dashed line is the Wigner distribution. In the legend, we show the NCBI GEO accession numbers for the original experiments on which the Bayesian inference computation are performed.

In Figure 3, we show the NNS distribution $P(s)$ for larger gene interaction network ID:165 (NCBI GEO accession number GSE29013) where the number of edges is $51,702$. This gene interaction network is computed from the gene expression experiments for 55 samples from lung cancer cells. The experimental platform is also GPL570. The adjacency matrix is calculated with the edges which have frequencies $0.5 - 1.0$. We also show the distributions of NNS for the six similar size gene interaction networks in Figure 4. In all cases, $P(s)$ shows the Wigner distribution. We also point out that convergence to the Wigner distribution are better than that of the result of smaller networks with the Poisson distribution shown in Fig.2. The half of the 256 gene interaction networks in TCNG database have more than 38K edges. We obtain the universal Wigner distribution $P(s)$ for the interaction matrices for almost all of these gene interaction networks.



Figure 3: **Distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing in the large gene interaction network.** The nearest neighbor spacing distribution for the gene interaction network ID:165 in TCNG database. The total edge number is 51,702, and the highest quartile of the edge frequency $(0.5 - 1.0)$ are used for the calculation of interaction matrix M. The solid line shows the Wigner distribution. The size of the interaction matrix M is 7,994. The 309 levels in the range $1.25 - 1.5$ were unfolded before the calculation of the histogram.

3.2 The variation of P(s) due to different edge frequencies

Each experimental assay which is used for the Bayesian inference computation of gene interactions has a wide range in the number of microarray samples from 50 to 559. The number of samples is the same as the number of different conditions of the cancer cells, for example the number of patients whose tumor cell is taken in surgery. They may contain the normal cells as the control groups. In SiGN-NNSR algorithm, the number of samples recommended for the calculation is more than 100. However, we should suspect that the experimental noise becomes larger when the number of samples are increased. The computation time of Bayesian networks also grows heavily in large number of samples. Then we might have a lot of overlooked or under-estimated gene interactions due to both the experimental and the statistical treatments.

In order to see the dependency of the NNS distribution behavior of the gene interaction networks on computational biases, we compare $P(s)$ for different edge frequencies which express the statistical rigidity of the inferred edges.

3.2.1 The crossover of the Poisson distribution to the Wigner distribution

In Figure 5, the distribution $P(s)$ is plotted for the two groups categorized by the edge frequency in the case of ID:92 gene interaction network from TCNG.



Figure 4: **The nearest neighbor level spacing distributions for six gene interaction networks in TCNG.** The distributions of nearest neighbor level spacing in six gene interaction networks which are randomly chosen in TCNG database. The number of total edges are 50 305 (ID:195), 44 511 (ID:47), 45 789 (ID:184), 45 411 (ID:150), 44 861 (ID:170), and 46 360 (ID:166), respectively. They are in the large network group where the total number of edges are more than 38,000 (median of edge numbers of 256 networks). The solid line is the Wigner distribution and the dashed line is the Poisson distribution. In the legend, we show the NCBI GEO accession numbers for the original experiments on which the Bayesian inference computation are performed.

The total number of inferred edges is $26,717$ and the sample size is 53 with primary stage UICC II colon cancer. This network is a member of the smaller network group in which the number of inferred edges is less than 38K. As shown in Fig. 5, when the edge confidence factor (edge frequency) is low, the Poisson distribution of $P(s)$ is observed. However, with the large frequency edges, the $P(s)$ behavior changes to the Wigner distribution. Note that the larger frequency group $(0.3 - 1.0)$ contains twice as many edges than that of the lowest $(0.2 - 0.25)$ frequency group. We consider that this crossover of $P(s)$ between the Poisson and the Wigner distribution is due to loss of some special edges which results in dissociation between some sub-networks. It is also important to note that the Poisson distribution of $P(s)$ is due to vanishing of off-diagonal elements of corresponding matrices in RMT. We thus consider that the Wigner distribution of $P(s)$ infers the degeneracy or coupling of several gene interaction networks.



Figure 5: **The Poisson distribution of $P(s)$ changes to the Wigner distribution as the inferred edge reliability is raised.** The nearest neighbor level spacing distribution $P(s)$ comparison for the low and high edge frequency groups. When the edge frequency is higher, the reliability of this edge is also high. The gene interaction network is ID:92 in TCNG. The total number of edges is 26 717 and the 53 samples from the experiment (NCBI GEO accession number GSE18088) are used for the Bayesian network computation.

3.2.2 The Wigner distribution of P(s) converges better than the Poisson distribution

In Figure 6, we show $P(s)$ for TCNG ID:236 (the same data used in Fig. 1) gene interaction network. The sample size is 62. The Poisson distribution is observed in all of quartiles of edge frequencies. The number of edges are the same in these four groups. In this interaction network, we might say that the subtractions of certain edges do not decouple the network significantly. In Figure 7, we also plot $P(s)$ for the gene interaction network ID:26 for the edge frequency quartiles $0.2-0.25$, $0.25-0.3$, $0.3-0.5$ and $0.5-1.0$. In this gene network calculation, the sample size is 204. In this case we see the convergence to the Wigner distribution is better in all groups compared to the Poisson distribution behavior in Fig. 6. As shown in Fig. 7, the agreement between the data and the universal behaviors (the Wigner distribution) is almost independent of the edge frequency.

We also note that in the gene interaction networks which have less than 15,000 edges in TCNG, $P(s)$ show coincidence neither with the Poisson nor the Wigner distribution in all the edge frequency quartiles.



Figure 6: **The distribution $P(s)$ depends largely on the edge frequencies in Poisson case.** The distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing $P(s)$ for each quartile of edge frequency. The network ID:236 in TCNG database is used for the calculation (the same gene interaction network as used in Figure 1). The agreement with the Poisson distribution is seen in the largest $0.5-1.0$ edge frequency group.

4 Discussion

We have investigated the gene interaction networks which are computationally obtained from gene expression experiments of various human cancer cell using TCNG database. ([Tamada *et al.*, 2011]) With the method of random matrix theory, the universal Wigner distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing (NNS) distribution $P(s)$ is observed in the dense gene interaction networks which have large number of edges. In smaller networks, although the size of interaction matrices is 8000×8000 in both cases, the Poisson distribution of NNS is obtained. This Poisson behavior has been observed also in the previous study of the human cancer protein-protein interaction network. We have also observed that the gene interaction network shows the crossover of $P(s)$ from Poisson to Wigner distribution as the threshold of the edge frequency (or the edge confidence factor) is increased. Up to our investigations so far, the Poisson distribution of NNS is only obtained with the cancer related molecular interaction networks. We thus consider the Poisson behavior is related to the key topology of the networks of various transcripts related to human cancers.

We have investigated the relation of the universal Wigner distribution of NNL to the size of gene interaction networks. When the number of gene interactions is more than 38,000, almost all the networks show this universal behavior independent of the edge frequency factors. In the random matrix theory, the Wigner distribution is related to the degeneracy or coupling of complex networks in the large matrix size limit. It is important to further investigate the rela-



Figure 7: **The distribution $P(s)$ is almost independent of the edge frequencies in large gene interaction network case.** The distribution of nearest neighbor level spacing $P(s)$ for each quartile of edge frequency. The network ID:26 in TCNG database is used for the calculation. The number of total edges is 51 994 and the 204 samples from the experiment (NCBI GEO accession number GSE12276) are used for the Bayesian network computation. The Wigner distribution is observed in all the quartiles.

tion of the size of gene interaction networks in cancer cells to their topological behaviors in order to clarify the key feature of the disease.

The crossover and the transition of Poisson distribution to Wigner distribution is intriguing behavior of the gene interaction networks in cancer cells. We are going to further investigate the behavior of this transition. The dependencies both on the total number of edges and on the sample size of the original experiments for the Bayesian inference of gene interactions (edge frequency thresholds) are both important.

In this study, we have omitted the direction of the edges which might express the gene regulatory relations. However, we note that the universality of $P(s)$ is independent of the details of the interaction network systems. We are also interested in the similar RMT analysis for the directed gene interaction networks in near future.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Shinobu Hikami for valuable comments.

References

[Akemann *et al.*, 2011] Akemann,G. et al. eds. (2011) *The Oxford handbook of random matrix theory*. Oxford University Press.

[Barabási, 2009] Barabási,A.-L. (2009) Scale-Free Networks: A Decade and Beyond, *Science*, **325**, 412-413.

[Brody, 1973] Brody,T. (1973) A statistical measure for the repulsion of energy levels. *Lett. Nuovo Cimento*, **7**, 482-484.

[Barrett *et al.*, 2011] Barrett,T. *et al.* (2011) NCBI GEO: Archive for functional genomics data sets-10 years on, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **39**, 1005-1010.

[Bartel, 2009] Bartel,D.P. (2009) MicroRNAs: Target Recognition and Regulatory Functions, *Cell*, **136**, 215-233.

[Cech,T.R. and Steitz,J.A., 2014] Cech,T.R. and Steitz,J.A. (2014) The noncoding RNA revolution - Trashing old rules to forge new ones, *Cell*, **157**, 77-94.

[Creixell *et al.*, 2015] Creixell,P. *et al.* (2015) Pathway and network analysis of cancer genomes, *Nat. Methods*, **12**, 615-621.

[Flamant *et al.*, 2010] Flamant,S. *et al.* (2010) Micro-RNA response to imatinib mesylate in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia, *Haematologica*, **95**, 1325-1333.

[Goh *et al*, 2007] Goh,K. et al. (2007) The human disease network, *PNAS*, **104**, 8685-8690.

[Gulati *et al.*, 2013] Gulati,S. et al. (2013) Cancer networks and beyond: interpreting mutations using the human interactome and protein structure, *Semin. Cancer Biol.*, **23**, 219-226.

[Guo *et al.*, 2013] Guo,X. et al. (2013) Increasing expression of microRNA 181 inhibits porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus replication and has implications for controlling virus infection, *J. Virol.*, **87**, 1159-1171.

[Jonsson *et al.*, 2006] Jonsson,P.F. et al. (2006) Cluster analysis of networks generated through homology: automatic identification of important protein communities involved in cancer metastasis, *BMC Bioinformatics*, **7**, 2.

[Jonsson and Bates, 2006] Jonsson,P.F. and Bates,P.A. (2006) Global topological features of cancer proteins in the human interactome, *Bioinformatics*, **22**, 2291-2297.

[Kling *et al.*, 2015] Kling,T. et al. (2015) Efficient exploration of pan-cancer networks by generalized covariance selection and interactive web content, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **43**, e98.

[Léveillé *et al.*, 2015] Léveillé,N. et al. (2015) Genome-wide profiling of p53-regulated enhancer RNAs uncovers a subset of enhancers controlled by a lncRNA, *Nat. Commun.*, **6**, 6520.

[Lim *et al.*, 2005] Lim,L.P. et al. (2005) Microarray analysis shows that some microRNAs downregulate large numbers of target mRNAs, *Nature*, **433**, 769-773.

[Luo *et al.*, 2006] Luo,F. *et al.* (2006) Application of random matrix theory to biological networks, *Phys. Lett. A*, **357**, 420-423.; Luo,F. *et al.* (2006) Application of random matrix theory to microarray data for discovering functional gene modules, *Phys. Rev. E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys.*, **73**, 031924.

[Luo *et al.*, 2007] Luo,F. *et al.* (2007) Constructing gene co-expression networks and predicting functions of unknown genes by random matrix theory, *BMC Bioinformatics*, **8**, 299.

[Margolin *et al.*, 2006] Margolin,A.A. et al. (2006) Reverse engineering cellular networks, *Nat Protoc*, **1**, 662-671.

[Mattick and Makunin, 2005] Mattick,J.S. and Makunin,I. V. (2005) Small regulatory RNAs in mammals, *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, **14**, 121-132.

[Mehta, 1991] Mehta,M.L. (1991) *RANDOM MATRICES*. Academic Press, Inc.

[Le Novère, 2015] Le Novère,N. (2015) Quantitative and logic modelling of molecular and gene networks, *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, **16**, 146-158.

[Pe'er and Hacohen, 2011] Pe'er,D. and Hacohen,N. (2011) Principles and strategies for developing network models in cancer, *Cell*, **144**, 864-873.

[Reichl, 1992] Reichl,L.E. (1992) *T*he Transition to Chaos. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc.

[Sanz-Pamplona *et al.*, 2012] Sanz-Pamplona,R. et al. (2012) Tools for protein-protein interaction network analysis in cancer research, *Clin. Transl. Oncol.*, **14**, 3-14.

[Taft *et al.*, 2010] Taft,R.J. et al. (2010) Non-coding RNAs: regulators of disease, *J. Pathol.*, **220**, 126-139.

[Tamada *et al.*, 2011] Tamada,Y. et al. (2011) Estimating genome-wide gene networks using nonparametric bayesian network models on massively parallel computers, *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinforma.*, **8**, 683-697.

[Vidal *et al.*, 2011] Vidal,M. et al. (2011) Interactome Networks and Human Disease, *Cell*, **144**, 986-998.